

LEADERSHIP IN A GENDER DIVERSE MILITARY:
WOMEN AT THE NATION'S SERVICE ACADEMIES --
THE TWENTY YEAR MARK

Final Report of Conference

Held on

20-23 March 1997

at

U. S. Coast Guard Academy

Prepared by

LCDR Anne Flammang

Linda Huzzey, Ph.D.

Gwendolyn Stevens, Ph.D.

Sharon Zelmanowitz, Ph.D.

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE MAR 1997		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-1997 to 00-00-1997	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Leadership in a Gender Diverse Military: Women at the Nation's Service Academies - The Twenty Year Mark				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Coast Guard Academy ,31 Mohegan Avenue ,New London ,CT,06320-8103				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 36	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Table of Contents

I Conference Report Summaries	Page No.
1. Conference preparation and execution	3
2. Conference Evaluation	8
3. Treasurer's Report	10
4. Survey of Coast Guard Academy Graduates	15
II Appendices	
1. CITE Descriptions	17
2. Conference Evaluation data	19
3. Survey data	24

Conference Planning and Execution

After the Superintendent of the U. S. Coast Guard Academy received the Ford Foundation grant in April 1996, a conference date of March 20-23, 1997 was selected, and the chairs of the conference committee, LCDR Anne Flammang , Dr. Linda Huzzey, Dr. Gwendolyn Stevens, and Dr. Sharon Zelmanowitz divided the planning into distinct elements: soliciting and evaluating scholarly papers, identifying keynote speakers, organizing the program, developing announcement and registration materials, and preparing the facilities.

To facilitate total campus interest, to ensure that all conference elements would be thoughtfully addressed, and to eliminate the possibility of the conference being seen as a "women's conference," a large interdisciplinary committee was created that included representatives from the athletic division, academic division, Commandant of Cadets staff, and the Leadership Development Center transition team. Numerous benefits accrued from expanding the committee. First, all official instructions authorizing the conference listed the names of each committee member, thereby announcing to the Academy at large that the conference would have an impact on the entire community. Moreover, the committee's mix of civilian, military, senior, junior, men, women, Euro-American, African American, academic and military professional members indicated that discussions about leadership would embrace diverse experiences.

In addition, expanding the committee yielded invaluable suggestions in planning the conference. For example, one member recommended a keynote speaker and another recommended contracting professionals to video-tape the proceedings, which ultimately proved to be a valuable addition to the conference. The six additional members included CDR Scott Burhoe, Professor Ray Cieplik, CDR Dick Hartnett, Ms JoAnn Miller, CDR Jim Sabo, and LCDR Don Triner. The entire group hereafter shall be identified as the Committee.

The Committee's attention during the first four months of planning was focused on identifying potential keynote speakers and locating paper presenters. The Committee contracted with Benson-Hepker Designs, Inc., in Iowa City, IA, who developed an eye-catching logo designed to attract scholars whose research focuses on women in the military, leadership theory, gender and pedagogy, and/or

gender theory and leadership. The logo was used on the call for papers, posters, announcements, conference programs, as well as, on conference stationary and tee shirts. The call for papers was sent in October to a mailing list of 637 individuals. To compile the mailing list, the Committee targeted leadership institutes and centers, university women's studies departments, the federal military academies, New England maritime academies, and other military colleges, such as Norwich University, Virginia Military Institute, and the Citadel. Additionally, the Committee contacted Ms Georgia Sadler of the Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI) who agreed to share the mailing list she had developed for WREI's December 1996 conference, "Women in Uniform."

The Committee carried out a review of the literature on leadership and gender theory to create a list of possible keynote speakers. The keynote addresses grew from an original idea of two, to six. Keynote speakers included Major General Claudia Kennedy (Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, United States Army); Dr. Mady Wechsler Segal (Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland); Mr. Anson Dorrance (Varsity Women's Soccer Coach, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill); Vice Admiral Patricia Tracey (Chief, Naval Education and Training Command, United States Navy); Mr. Patrick Kennedy (United States Representative from Rhode Island); and Ms Kathryn Higgins (then Assistant to the President for Cabinet Affairs).¹

At the end of November, the Committee selected 17 scholarly papers, both theoretical and empirical, which were organized into five panels: "Women in the Military: Some Historical Highlights"; "The Confines of Gender Roles"; "Communications: What We Do and Don't Say"; "Classroom Climate and Learning" and "Gender and Leadership: Toward a New Model." In addition to a moderator, each panel had a discussant who synthesized and reflected the main points. Presenters and discussants included faculty from military academies and civilian colleges, junior colleges and universities, college administrators, graduate students, and independent scholars. A wide range of experience and scholarly achievement was therefore represented.

The Committee recognized that some attendees may not have had much exposure to either leadership or gender theory. To facilitate everyone's learning, the conference program included two

¹ For complete biographies of the keynote speakers, please see the conference program.

interactive events: breakout sessions moderated by trained facilitators where participants could discuss the issues in a small-group format and a presentation by the Cornell Interactive Theater,² who demonstrated the effects of chill in the classroom and led the participants in a discussion of the issues.

In mid-January announcements with registration materials were sent to everyone on the mailing list. A Web page that included registration information and forms was designed. The Web page perhaps more effectively publicized the conference than the announcements. Although we did not formally poll participants to determine how they had heard about the conference, in casual conversation, it became clear that many learned about the conference through electronic networks. Besides advertising the conference widely, we also specifically targeted the military academies, and announcements and posters were sent to the offices of each Superintendent, Dean of Academics, Commandant of Cadets, Athletic Director, and chair of leadership studies departments at each of the federal service academies and the Merchant Marine Academy. The Superintendent, Dean of Academics, and Commandant of Cadets at the Coast Guard Academy also forwarded personal letters of invitation to each of their cohorts.

The Committee had predicted that approximately 100 scholars and military officers and 50 cadets and midshipmen would participate. Over 200 participants (scholars, military officers, enlisted, cadets and midshipmen) from civilian institutions, the Coast Guard, Naval, Military, Merchant Marine, and Air Force Academies, Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Naval Academy Preparatory School, Virginia Military Institute, Norwich Academy, and various Coast Guard Units attended the conference. Several members of the Coast Guard Academy's Board of Trustees also participated, including Admiral Allen, Admiral Ames, Admiral Larrabee, Admiral Tozzi, RADM Versaw, Mr. Sommerville, RADM Teeson, and RADM Woolover.

The panel sessions and five the keynote addresses were held in the ballroom of Leamy Hall, which features a wall of floor to ceiling plate-glass windows overlooking the lower athletic fields of the Academy, the picturesque Academy sailing center, and the Thames River. Although so much natural light presented a challenge for the director of the conference video, the view contributed to the open atmosphere the Committee had hoped to create. Coffee service and continental breakfasts were served in

² For a description of CITE, see Appendix 1.

the lower lounge of Leamy Hall, a half floor below the ballroom. The opening banquet and the luncheon banquets were held in the Coast Guard Academy's Officers' Club. The Cornell Interactive Theater presented its scenario in the small auditorium of Dimick Hall. The closing banquet was held at the Mystic Marinelife Aquarium in Mystic, Connecticut, which offered an unusual and tranquil dining experience.

Several themes arose during the presentations, keynotes, and discussions: women as leaders within the military hierarchy, women as subject to the leadership of others, and women as cadets/midshipmen peers in the intensive training environment at military colleges.³ Anson Dorrance, keynote at the opening banquet, energized the participants with his discussion of whether the same coaching style is effective for both men and women. Based on his twenty years of experience and great success in coaching both men and women's soccer, Mr. Dorrance noted that he has found that men and women athletes interrelate and communicate in distinct ways and assess their personal strengths and weaknesses differently. He reported that successful coaches must employ motivational strategies specific to the gender of their team.

Another theme, that equity does not equate with sameness, was addressed by several panelists. For example, CDR Lisa Ane Curtin (Ed. D., Fellow, Center for Naval Analysis) in conjunction with CDR Elizabeth Holmes (Ph.D., Professor of Leadership, Ethics and Law, United States Naval Academy) corroborated other research results, which have revealed that men and women communicate differently and sometimes at cross-purposes. CDR Curtin highlighted the potential negative impact that dysfunctional communication may have on an increasingly gender-diverse organization.

Not skirting controversy, several conference participants argued that traditional gender role definitions are confining and suggested that the culture and the rites and rituals of an organization need to be rigorously examined. Dr. Gwendolyn Stevens (Director of Academic Resources & Professor of Psychology, United States Coast Guard Academy) suggested that women continue to have problems integrating into the armed services because the image of women warriors is frightening to men.

³ For the quantitative evaluation and a list of issues raised at the last interactive discussion session, Sunday morning, see Appendix 2.

Moreover, women's presence creates considerable anxiety for men whose gender identity may be vulnerable and narrowly defined. Dr. Judith A. Youngman (Associate Professor of Political Science, United States Coast Guard Academy, and Chair of the Defense Advisory Council on Women in the Services), in association with Dr. Sue Guenter-Schlesinger (Director Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Office, Utah State University), argued that "male models" of leadership and communication create a "glass box" for women, contributing to women's difficulty in gaining access to the mainstream culture and the decision-making centers of the academies.

The panels were punctuated by powerful keynote addresses. On Friday morning, Dr. Mady Wechsler Segal discussed the process of "cultural amnesia," by which the historical contributions of women to the armed services have been forgotten. On a less theoretical level, Major General Claudia J. Kennedy discussed professional interpersonal relationships. First she focused on "bonding" and how women must learn to work together, rather than permitting the male-dominated organizational structure of the services to divide them. Major General Kennedy stressed the importance of bonding between men and women, but she also emphasized the importance of respecting boundaries that should not be transgressed.

Representative Patrick Kennedy, the Saturday breakfast keynote speaker, urged the participants to include Congressional Representatives in discussions about leadership and gender. Without such inclusion, he warned, Congress might mandate gender segregated training, a step backwards for the services. Ms Higgins reported on a review of newspaper and magazine stories and suggested that negative articles about the service significantly outnumber positive articles. She argued that the services must publicize the positive stories about women and men working together successfully, and she cited her own experience with the Coast Guard during the TWA Flight 800 recovery operation as evidence that a gender-integrated service successfully completes its missions. Finally, Vice Admiral Patricia Ann Tracey argued forcefully that any discussion of leadership and gender must ultimately consider leadership in a combat situation, a perspective that left the audience speechless.

Conference Evaluation

In addition to initiating a balanced and meaningful discussion concerning how the nations' service academies can best prepare their graduates for successful careers in a gender-diverse military, the purpose of the Leadership in a Gender Diverse Military conference was to assist the Coast Guard Academy to meet two of the Coast Guard Commandant's organizational goals regarding leadership and diversity: "Provide leadership and a working environment to enable all of our people to reach their full potential," and "Place diversity in the Coast Guard at center stage." Specific conference goals included the following:

1. to increase awareness of and knowledge about gender-related issues at the service academies;
2. to explore the components of gender, student development, learning and leadership styles;
3. to expose participants to theories and research at the forefront of gender and leadership studies;
4. to foster an exchange of ideas among participants; and
5. to collect and collate responses from academy graduates to questions relating to conference issues;

The three-day program was ambitious, and we met our objectives with varied success. The scholarly portion of the conference succeeded in raising questions and presenting research that provoked thoughtful reflection. During the two-days of panel presentations and keynote addresses, the atmosphere in Leamy Hall was charged with palpable excitement. One sensed that many of the participants had longed for an opportunity to discuss openly the topic of leadership and gender in the military; the conference finally afforded them that opportunity.

The tremendous potential impact of these presentations was attenuated by the limited time for discussion, either during panel sessions or in small group break-out sessions. In retrospect, the conference should have been longer and divided into two halves: panel presentations and keynote addresses and small group work, facilitated by experts in leadership theory and gender theory. In the small groups, conference participants would have had an opportunity to process the arguments and research presented in the papers, and they would have had time to brainstorm a model of leadership that

takes into account gender differences. Attendees noted the weakness of attempting to do too much in too little time. Some, in particular, critiqued the conference because the panel sessions did not address the practice of leadership at gender-integrated units or bases. Discussion in small groups might have addressed such concerns.

It is too early to report the long-term impact of the conference. Although there were two articles in the local newspaper that presented information about General Kennedy's and Admiral Tracey's speech, in general, the media did not take note of the conference. Therefore, the public did not learn about some of the positive steps that the service academies are taking to improve leadership education and training. Absent such publicity, however, we do predict that the conference will be followed by similar conferences at other academies. Representatives from the Air Force Academy tentatively offered to host a follow-up conference. We hope that the Air Force Academy will continue the fruitful discussions begun in New London and that some measurable progress towards understanding leadership and gender in the military can be made through committed attention and continued scholarly discussion and debate.

A brief summary of the conference "Leadership in a Gender Diverse Military: The Conference" appeared in *The United States Coast Guard Academy Alumni Bulletin* (Vol., 59 [3], 16-17, 1997). Additionally, LCDR Flammang discussed the conference as part of an Academy panel on "Leadership in Support of Diversity" at the "Gender and Race on the Campus and in the School: Beyond Affirmative Action" a three-day symposium prior to the 1997 conference of the American Association of University Women (19-21 June 1997, Anaheim, California). We also expect that there will be a brief item about the conference in the next issue of *Women in Higher Education*. We are currently preparing a proceedings of the conference which will appear as a double issue of MINERVA, published by the MINERVA center for the study of women and the military.

Treasurer's Report

The \$30,000 grant from the Ford Foundation was used to fund consultants, travel and accommodations, printing and design, and miscellaneous (supplies). Additional expenses were covered by funds from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, registration fees, and the sale of T-shirts.

The Academy contributed approximately \$32,187 based on the cost of contracting similar services and equipment.

The conference registration fee (\$50 for non-students and \$15 for students, cadets, and midshipmen) was used, among other things, to fund the Saturday night banquet at Mystic Aquarium. The registration fees combined with the T-shirts sales amounted to \$9,418.

For itemized expenditures and income see Budget Tables

Table 1

Table I: ITEMS FUNDED THROUGH FORD FOUNDATION GRANT

<i>Check Recipient</i>	<i>Payment</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
A. Travel /Accommodations		
USCG MWR Fund	(\$8,808.39)	Officer's club fees for working meals.
USCGA O'Club	(\$100.00)	Down payment for Officer's club.
Fisher Florist Corp	(\$635.00)	Flowers for tables at conference.
Mady Segal	(\$923.07)	Travel/accommodations for keynote (Dr. Segal).
Ray Cieplik	(\$372.00)	Travel/accommodations for keynote (Mr. Dorrance).
Arrow Paper	(\$1,091.21)	Chairs, tablecloths, platform covers for 3 days.
The Arrow Line	(\$300.00)	Shuttle bus rental for conference.
Arrow Line	(\$150.00)	Shuttle bus rental.
Sub-total	(\$12,379.67)	
B. Honoraria/Consultant Fees		
Mady Segal	(\$1,000.00)	Honoraria for keynote speaker.
Anson Dorance	(\$500.00)	Honoraria for keynote speaker.
Cornell Univ	(\$5,000.00)	Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble.
TRV Media	(\$4,531)	Video Taping/Sound System Fees.
Sub-total	(\$11,030.68)	
C. Miscellaneous/Supplies		
Mystic Florist	(\$50.00)	Centerpiece.
Quality Printers	(\$451.26)	Conference pads with logo.
Anne Flammang	(\$43.20)	Gift for keynote speaker.
Sub-total	(\$544.46)	
D. Printing		
Benson & Hepker	(\$2,787.99)	Design and printing of call for papers and posters.
Benson & Hepker	(\$3,257.20)	Design and printing of announcements, envelopes, and conference programs.
Sub-total	(\$6,045.19)	
Total Grant Funds Spent	\$32,187.00	

Table 2

TABLE 2: ACADEMY RESOURCES PROVIDED

Item	Approximate Value#
Video tape funding*	\$2,387.00
Clerical Support 1/2 time for 1 year	\$15,000
Summer Faculty Salary-9 weeks	\$10,000
Conference Facilities, Set-up & & Audio-visual Equipment	\$3,000
Postage for Mailings	\$1,500
Van Shuttle Setvice	\$300
Total	\$32,187.00

* This is the amount of money donated by the Coast Guard Academy to help fund TRV Media for professional video tape production.

Based on approximate cost of contracting similar services/equipment.

Table 3

Table 3: ITEMS FUNDED THROUGH CONFERENCE FEES

Check Recipient	Amount	Explanation
Mystic Marine Life	(\$100.00)	Down payment for banquet hall.
Two Sisters Deli	(\$100.00)	Down payment for Sat banquet food.
Mystic Marinelife	(\$1,150.00)	Aquarium rental.
Quality Printers	(\$110.00)	Name tag printing.
Allyn B. Donatti	(\$352.00)	Harpist for banquet.
Arrow Paper	(\$1,177.19)	Tables, chairs, supplies for banquet.
2 Sisters Deli	(\$5,210.50)	Banquet food and setup.
Cask & Keg	(\$362.24)	Complimentary glass beer or wine.
Tees Plus	(\$519.75)	Conference T-shirts (payment for shirts included in fees collected)
Scheffelin (return fee)	(\$50.00)	Returned registration fee for Edward Scheffelin.
Sharon Zelmanowitz	(\$50.00)	Name tag holders.
Sharon Zelmanowitz	(\$61.11)	Name tag holders.
Crestline Co	(\$164.43)	Pushy pencils with conference logo.
Total Fee Funded Items	(\$9,407.22)	
Total Fees Collected	\$9,418.00	

Table I: ITEMS FUNDED THROUGH FORD FOUNDATION GRANT

Check Recipient	Payment	Explanation
A. Travel /Accommodations		
USCG MWR Fund	(\$8,808.39)	Officer's club fees for working meals.
USCGA O'Club	(\$100.00)	Down payment for Officer's club.
Fisher Florist Corp	(\$635.00)	Flowers for tables at conference.
Mady Segal	(\$923.07)	Travel/accommodations for keynote (Dr. Segal).
Ray Cieplik	(\$372.00)	Travel/accommodations for keynote (Mr. Dorrance).
Arrow Paper	(\$1,091.21)	Chairs, tablecloths, platform covers for 3 days.
The Arrow Line	(\$300.00)	Shuttle bus rental for conference.
Arrow Line	(\$150.00)	Shuttle bus rental.
Sub-total	(\$12,379.67)	
B. Honoraria/Consultant Fees		
Mady Segal	(\$1,000.00)	Honoraria for keynote speaker.
Anson Dorance	(\$500.00)	Honoraria for keynote speaker.
Cornell Univ	(\$5,000.00)	Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble.
TRV Media	(\$4,531)	Video Taping/Sound System Fees.
Sub-total	(\$11,030.68)	
C. Miscellaneous/Supplies		
Mystic Florist	(\$50.00)	Centerpiece.

Quality Printers	(\$451.26)	Conference pads with logo.
Anne Flammang	(\$43.20)	Gift for keynote speaker.
Sub-total	(\$544.46)	
D. Printing		
Benson & Hepker	(\$2,787.99)	Design and printing of call for papers and posters.
Benson & Hepker	(\$3,257.20)	Design and printing of announcements, envelopes, and conference programs.
Sub-total	(\$6,045.19)	
Total Grant Funds Spent	(\$30,000.00)	

Survey of Graduates

The grant proposal included conducting a survey of Coast Guard Academy graduates. A questionnaire using a combination of Likert-type attitudinal, experiential, and open-ended questions was developed and sent to 575 graduates of the Coast Guard Academy,⁴ 217 returned the survey, a 37.5% response rate (115 women and 102 men).

The responses given by men and women, on several questions did not differ beyond chance when analyzed statistically (cf. Appendix 3). However, the several questions where there was a gender difference suggest that men and women experience the academy differentially. For example, while 80% of the men believed that they were aligned with their military career choice by the end of their second class year, only 54% of the women reported that they felt comfortable with their career choice. Contributing to this feeling of comfort may be the degree to which cadets believe that they have been accepted by their peers. Ninety-six percent and 91% of males believed that they had been accepted by their male and female classmates, respectively. On the other hand, only 61% of females reported that they remember feeling accepted by their male classmates, while 73% of them remembered having felt accepted by female classmates. Contributing to this disparity, perhaps, is the degree to which cadets believe that they have been encouraged to network with same-gendered cadets. Although 60% of women and 49% of men believe that they were encouraged to network with same-gendered cadets, 73% of men believed that women were encouraged to network together (compared to 47% of women who believe this) and 56% of women believed that men were encouraged to network together (compared to 50% of men who believe that they were encouraged to network with same gendered cadets).

In identifying mentor characteristics, both men and women graduates rated communication, competence, experience, knowledge, supportiveness, and leadership ability (undefined) to be more important than advocacy, empathy, fairness, helpfulness, objectivity, or nurturance. Additionally, women and men reported that they have had both informal and formal mentors, although men noted

⁴ All of the women who have graduated and an equal number of men who were randomly selected from each class from 1980 to 1996. Six hundred and sixty-eight (668) graduates of the Coast Guard Academy were identified as the respondent sample. There were no current addresses (or the identified graduate was deceased) for 61 potential subjects and an additional 22 were returned for incorrect addresses.

that they have had more formal mentors. Only 18% of women believed that the gender of an mentor is important, while 28% of men reported that they believed that the gender of the mentor is important. This differential reflects the fact that there are more men than women in the Coast Guard. If women are to have mentors, they are more likely to be men. Only slightly more than half of the responders reported that they had met women officers while at CGA who were good leaders and role models, compared to almost 100% of the responders noted that while at CGA they had met men whom they considered to be good leaders and role models.

In relation to being prepared for their first assignment, 61% of women compared to 74% of men believed that they had been given adequate leadership experiences. However, only 52% of women compared to 64% of men believed that they felt prepared to handle the responsibility of a division officer during their first assignment. Additionally, 21% of women but only 5% of men did not feel confident in their leadership ability by the end of their first tour. Related to this, 12% of women but only 1% of men believed that on their first assignment, they were not respected by their subordinates and 36% of women but only 15% of men believed that their OER did not accurately reflect their performance as an officer.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Cornell Interactive Theater Ensemble

Friday March 21, 1997

A highlight of the conference was a performance by the Cornell Interactive Theater Ensemble (CITE). They perform skits and facilitate interactive experiences to explore human relations issues in educational and work environments. For this conference, CITE worked closely with the Committee to tailor a program that will specifically meet the needs of the audience,

At the Leadership in a Gender Diverse Military Conference, CITE employed two professional actors and a facilitator; the sketch concerned academic climate issues for women students.

The skit was titled "Hang in there and be tough." The characters were Mia Mfume (an African-American female engineering student) and Professor Harry Bindoff her academic advisor (a white male engineering professor). A third character, who was not actually present was senior male faculty member in engineering with whom Ms Mfume was having difficulty, a Professor John Clark. The play opened with Mia coming to her advisor's office to talk about a problem. Professor Bindoff is very friendly at first and asks her what she is concerned about. She tells him that one of her teachers, Prof Clark, has made comments and encouraged her classmates to behave in ways that make her feel unwelcome in the class. Just then the phone rings and Prof Bindoff engages in a telephone conversation where it becomes apparent that he is Prof Clark's research partner and friend. Prof Bindoff returns to his conversation with Mia, suggesting that Prof Clark would not intentionally make her feel ill at ease. He suggests that she confront him in person to resolve the issue. Mia has serious doubts and is visibly discouraged by the advice she has received. Prof Bindoff also suggests that Mia talk with a female professor because women have similar experiences. As Mia leaves the office he tells her to "hang in there and be tough" and to let him know how the situation is going.

Following the play, the actors remained in character and fielded questions from the audience. There was a great deal of enthusiastic participation as audience members probed the characters for their motives, their plans, and their feelings about the meeting in Prof Bindoff's office. The last part of the program involved a facilitator-led discussion among the audience members.

It was apparent that the interactive experience struck an emotional cord with many of the audience members. A large portion of the audience felt that Mia's situation had not been handled well by Prof Bindoff. However, many vocal audience members defended the Professor's approach which made for a lively and interesting dialogue. Occasionally comments made by an audience member defending Prof Bindoff elicited a few "boos" from the audience. However, generally the discussion was respectful and allowed for a meaningful exchange between audience participants.

The CITE program proved to be an excellent vehicle for initiating a meaningful discussion among conference participants concerning a chilly academic climate at the service academies. This laid the foundation for further exploration and dialogue the next day at the panel session on classroom climate and learning.

APPENDIX 2

Evaluation of Conference

The following summary is from 24 (11.4% of total number of registered attendees) evaluation forms which were submitted to the conference organizers.

Conference Evaluation

Conference Evaluation	Response Alternatives 1 = least useful or disagree; 4 = most useful or agree			
Questions	1	2	3	4
Breakout sessions -				
Thursday pm *	3		3	
Friday pm -- facilitated closure for Friday's sessions *	7	5	6	1
Friday pm -- facilitated change at individual institution *	3	4	8	4
Breakout sessions -- Sunday am *	1		3	8
Panels				
Women in the Military - Historical Highlights	1	9	9	4
Confines of Gender Roles	1	7	12	4
Communications	1	1	15	6
Classroom Climate		3	9	9
Gender & Leadership - Toward a New Model	1	1	12	5
Cornell Interactive Theater		2	12	8

* Because of time delays, Thursday's and Friday's sessions were cut short. Only 80 of the 225 attendees participated on Sunday.

Conference Evaluation Form -- Participants response to keynote speakers

	Response Alternatives 1 = Most useful 5 = Least useful				
Keynote Speakers					
Mr. Anson Dorrance	5	5	2	2	2
Dr. Mady Segal	2	3	5	10	1
Major General Claudia Kennedy	7	5	5		6
Rep. Patrick Kennedy	6	3	5	5	4
Vice Admiral Patricia Tracey	6	3	4	4	3
Ms. Kathryn Higgins **	1	1	1		

** Ms Higgins' name was accidentally omitted from the evaluation form.

Conference participants overall conference evaluation.

Conference Evaluation	Response Alternatives 1 = Least useful ; 5 = most useful				
Compared to other conferences, this was	3	1	6	11	3

Open ended questions from Evaluation

The ambiance at this conference was

Excellent -- highly motivated attendees & presenters (but needed more time for processing -- too tight time schedule).
 Excellent -- except for the morning of day 1.
 Great, stimulating.
 Great.
 Excellent, great communication among attendees.
 Some topics made me feel somewhat depressed while others I felt very strongly about.
 Outstanding.
 Hostile toward men -- men who you need to do what you want to do. You pissed me off from the beginning and I have been supporting true leadership in actual combat with women. Tone down the rhetoric and stop the history classes. I

gave up my weekend to be here. Do not insult me by rehashing old news that I've had shoved down my throat for years.
Too little time.
The conference was needed and I received good information, but I do not think it was user friendly. I felt left out during the breaks.
Wonderful opportunity for networking but very long panel sessions. Papers should be available to all participants at conference.
Too little time and breakout sessions should have been more organized. Friendly and cooperative.
Awesome, stimulating, encouraging.
Great.
Generally positive/enthusiastic; oriented toward action.
Generally positive and constructive. At times, there was an over-personalization of issues which created an affect-laden response by some that clouded the issue of problem-solving.
Professional. The level of information shared was quite high. The quality of the speakers outstanding, even exceptional.
Excellent.
Friendly, informative, helpful.
No uniforms next time.
Enthusiastic. Open to new/old information.
Was open minded and free to state your opinion.
Very comfortable.
I felt as if every female present was a feminist. It came across that men are bad and the cause of all problems in a gender diverse world.

Please list three ways in which your thinking about the issues of gender and leadership have changed as a result of this conference

Didn't change -- conference reinforced what I already felt and thought about gender & leadership, especially in the military environment.
Too large a group, much better with more small groups.
I am more aware, have been naive; my role as an "individual" in an organization; do my own research & papers & strive toward higher goals.
How tradition effects the issues; shared views throughout the services; its time to focus on the positive.
Conference should be during the week, so that we don't lose people because of weekend and possible due to religious celebrations.
Got a greater understanding on issues facing both men and women; problems with service academies and the military in general; the keynote speakers were quite good and addressed issues with women in the military.
Significance of women's tendency to blend in at the expense of doing what is right; importance of a formal mentoring system; define general leadership challenge in incoming plebs/assess outcomes for character integrity -- how I don't know.
You have caused me to become even more cautious around women; I am more uncomfortable because most of the women treated me as a "man" not as a leader who has lead diverse groups successfully; I am not happy with the closed mindedness of women advocating equality. The "all or nothing at all," mentality will doom your goals.
Debate is good; need next step -- develop solution set; move the discussions service wide.
Reinforced need to address issues of inter-sectionality (gender, race ethnicity, class, sexuality).
I learned a lot of stuff I did not know. Also good because there wasn't a lot of 3 stars standing up and giving us a bunch of politically correct rhetoric that is devoid of content.
Things aren't as bad as I thought; we have very far to go, though.
Realized core traditional values attitudes among cadets are very difficult to overcome despite clear evidence that corps are jointly housed; efforts to educate young women about other achievements of women in the military is important.
Intervention needs to begin at the top of leadership and at the bottom -- beginning with individual's introduction to the military -- if change is to occur; As major general Kennedy stated: power will not be handed to you, it has to come from within. To this end, we need to engender this by the climate we maintain. The larger issue is one of socialization, once we direct our focus to similarities and less on differences, change & acceptance & integration will accelerate.
Too much stuff in too short a time period. Advertising perhaps limited. I gained some clarity on situations I experienced in the USMC in the 80's. Gained awareness of communication and leadership style issues.
I am more optimistic that we can succeed; I am more clear about the issues and what needs to be done; I am convinced we are the agents of social change.
My thinking has been stimulated to ask questions. for example, how do the findings from studies conducted at the academies compare to the attitudes and events in the field?
Diversity is more important than uniformity and if we focus on mission instead of tradition we will solve the problems of gender differences in the military.

I expect the men to accept greater responsibility for their behavior and correct it when inappropriate. I am less willing to excuse men for their complicity in the subjugation of women by passively allowing other males to actively offend and exploit women.

More aware of things that are happening around me; to use common sense; to be able to face the situation of gender.

I will now look at how I communicate differently but not the way I act. Action defined by my honesty and commitment to my institution guiding values.

I realized that people are making a much bigger deal about this issue than I had previously thought. I have become more aware of gender issues around me and will pay more attention to the way men and women around me act/react. I've become more bitter toward the way some women go overboard in their thinking that women got the raw end of the deal all the time.

Additional comments?

Not enough time provided for reflection and discussion.

Totally academic; begs the question, who & what is being taught at USCGA?

Have breakout sessions between each panel; take what we went through in two days and divide into three days; Sunday is a really bad day to conclude a conference.

Organized with a lot of information to cover in little time.

Should be done every 5 years and move among service academy locations.

I feel that more conferences should occur; maybe an all-women similar conference so we as a group we could talk about issues that affect us; harassment, fraternization, and issues between officers and enlisted need to be addressed next time.

Not enough time for breakout sessions; not enough time for the book store; Impressions -- too much "why" gender equity and very little on how to make it work in an operational environment. Policy for gender equality is a fact, implementation is an unknown. Communications papers the best. All the studies' results needed to be reduced to specific topics to be addressed in breakout sessions.

I came here for additional leadership skills. Instead I got a bunch of civilian women bashing the military -- particularly the Navy. Glass box gave some points but old data, generalities weakened the presentation. In the CITE production, no thought was given to how uncomfortable the professor was. Too little time. Panels only presented old information. The USNA Midshipmen's presentation was great -- real life stuff. Should have started with the last panel, I wouldn't have been turned off. Kennedy said nothing of value. Presenters were not receptive to other's ideas. Future conferences should have "real people" present "real life" military leadership examples as success stories. good news -- not negative.

Thanks for all the hard work.

More enlisted invited and senior enlisted speaker. More interaction -- working session; civilian attire may be useful for friendlier atmosphere.

Thanks for all the work and thought that went into this. I have organized conferences programs and know how difficult it is.

It is crucial that you set goals and direction for the breakout sessions. They needed it from what I saw, so that they don't digress into BS sessions. And it is crucial for emotional and cognitive integration of this material that we have more small group discussions sessions for people to process this stuff.

Sports analogy may work against women's integration because there's an underlying focus of physical attributes, which are biologically different. Need to focus on coaches/leaders in cognitive areas.

Recommend provide day care facilities for attendees for future conferences.

When I first looked at the schedule, I thought it was much too ambitious. When I looked at it again, I thought it was very unrealistic. Too much too little time.

Remarkable effort -- this should continue and will grow.

It would be helpful to have more time for interacting within the breakout groups.

Lighting in Leamy bad, too dark to read or write, meal service was slow, speed it up.

You may wish to consider small group dialogue after the panel presentation. Please do not schedule on Sunday. I certainly hope you have another conference next year, this is essential to making progress toward gender integration.

This conference provided inside view to what some of the key ideas of gender are. There were several areas that I disagree.

I now know the direction I want to take in my life in further study for a master's degree. If we put ourselves last and use our energy in support of our respective institutions we will do the right things to improve gender diverse leadership and improve our institutions.

Males and females need to change their behavior. Suck it up and drive on!. I question whether Friday's speakers (who are anti-male) have been to the academies and interacted with cadets, much of what was said does not hold true in my experiences.

Summary of small group work session Sunday morning

Improve training

- use scenarios, role-playing, case studies
- supply better written materials
- wardroom and other job-cites training
- better general environment

Change the system of evaluation and promotion

- trash it don't tweak it (keep people in grade, up or out, monitor Navy's system improvement)
- split evaluation feedback function from promotion.

More conferences.

- an inter-service follow up -- not just academy oriented
- keep continuity with these attendees but reach out to others
- a Coast Guard only conference to inaugurate LDC.

Immediate response to Sec. Higgins

- spread the word of actual leadership command success stories.

Need to think about the diversified mission of the Academies.

At academies vs. other military units identify issues of 17-21 year olds vs. adults.

In dealing with teenagers, need clear outcomes (however, enlisted in units are also often teenagers.)

- need to focus on developmental issues.
- primary challenge for cadets/midshipmen (1) understand self and (2) learn about the organization.
- wide variability in developmental level at academies.
- need to work to move all students toward increased sophistication.
- we need to facilitate female cadet/midshipmen behavior so that they are more comfortable with standing out.
- we need clear standards for faculty and cadets.

Is current 4/C training the best?

- is its philosophy of breaking individual down to build them up again the right thing to do?

Tradition is an issue.

- how we change tradition?
- which traditions do we change?
- is tradition the problem?
- tradition is not based on a rational model

Mass Maritime has a weekend program for women pre-summer training.

Instructional style is important.

Assign cross gender mentoring. Mentoring is important.

Evaluate curriculum.

- is engineering the best training for teaching people how to deal with people?
- we need to look at ward-room models; all training models.
- we've forgotten what's it like to be 17.
- there shouldn't be a disconnect between the classroom and the barracks.
- need to improve training, case studies, better materials.
- educate educators on instructional style
- leadership styles -- feminine and masculine good for both genders.
- change the barracks
- institutional responsibility for faculty development.
- classroom techniques to reinforce, promote leadership of women and diffuse gender stereotypes.

Need to determine priorities.

Successful women need to stand out.

Stress solutions, successes. Diversity of a team makes it strong.

Need a clear vision -- individual, organizational, unit, team.

How we respond to cadets and issues depends where we are in life's cycle.

Change the evaluation system, not people oriented.

More conferences.

Maintain networks developed here.

Spread word of success stories.

Define models.

More capabilities than can use because of limited model.

How to get bottom, top- & middle involved. Top-legislative, middle-administration, lower-training.

What is the cost of not changing

What we are trying to do is to incorporate human dignity and respect into training program.

Diverse workforce is what the organization needs.

Need to understand and value differences.

- sensitivity training on differences.
- men and women are different and its ok.

- diversity of thought is also important.
- what are similarities

Vision -- define values of respect.

Remove dinosaurs.

Reward good behavior.

Change attitudes.

Push women to apply for higher positions. Provide explanation for promotion to highlight success.

Expand corps values.

More conferences

- need solution strategies.
- conference was valuable -- sharing ideas and identifying the problems.
- still in reaction mode -- need to be proactive
- interactions between groups here at this conference was remarkable.
- important to see top role models.
- good net-working.
- more small group discussions after panels.

Need to know what motivates women admirals and generals.

Need to address practical problems.

Fraternization -- inappropriate sex behavior needs to be addressed.

Need to train on how to not only what not to do.

Engage issue of self esteem.

- training about eating disorders.
- eliminate harassment over weight standards.

What are dynamics of seclusion/ civilian vs. military.

Are gender roles still important?

- analyze the unspoken value of male supremacy.
- is male model the correct/natural model for services?

We should be working at a philosophical level

- management has philosophical roots of equality.
- can we impart philosophy.

Critical mass issue, 30%? Not unit level but entire organization.

Policy -- gender specific so that women don't attrit.

Individuals' passion should be accepted, even though it may make others uncomfortable.

More discussions

Encourage risk taking.

Need vision

Identify individuals strengths and use them appropriate to encourage mission.

- the reconciliation of competency and opportunity.

Commitment to gender integration at all levels.

Recognize subtle discrimination.

Identify personality of self and organization.

Cross gender mentoring.

- mentor program for cadets and OCS
- 1st and 4th class mentor system

Communication essential and multi-layered.

- use civilian friends to advertise successes.

Academies and other military units need to have equal resources to fitness.

- athletic department at academies need to ensure equality.

Need to address body image issue with women at academies.

- need to address all elements of body image issue.

APPENDIX 3 Survey Results

Demographics

Of the 217 respondents, 63% of the women are married as are 70% of the men. The percentages of respondents who have children and the number of children that this group has are displayed on Table 1; 72% of women and 64% of men graduates have no children. Table 2 displays the ethnic identification of the respondents; the majority of men and women identified themselves as Anglo.

Table 1. Percent of children by gender of graduate

Percentage of officers with children			
		Women	Men
No Children		72.0	64.0
Yes Children		28.0	36.0
	1	40.6	48.6
	2	40.6	32.4
	3	15.6	13.5
	4	3.1	5.4

Table 2. Participants' racial/ethnic group identification

	Women	Men
	%	%
African-American		1.0
Latina/o	7.1	1.0
Anglo	87.6	91.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.4	5.2
Other	.9	1.0

Table 3 displays class-membership of the respondents. As can be observed, there was a fairly equal distribution from each class, for both men and women, who responded; a larger proportion of respondents, especially men respondents, coming from the last three years, 94, 96, & 96. Table 4 displays the current rank of respondents, 65% of women and 62% of men respondents are LTjgs and LTs. On Table 5 the respondents MBTI scores can be observed; this data reflects 54% of women respondents and 37% of men respondents, others were unable to remember their type.

Table 3. CGA Graduation year

Percentage of respondents from each class year		
Class Year	Women (N=115)	Men (N=102)
80	5.3	3.9
81	4.4	2.9
82	1.8	3.9
83	2.6	2.0
84	6.1	4.9
85	3.5	3.9
86	4.4	3.9
87	7.0	3.9
88	3.5	6.9
89	8.8	6.9
90	1.8	2.9
91	3.5	5.9
92	7.9	6.9
93	9.6	6.9
94	11.4	10.8
95	13.2	10.8
96	5.3	12.7

Table 4. Current rank of respondents.

Rank	% of Women	% of Men
Ensign	7.3	13.5
LTjg	39.6	31.5
LT	26.0	30.3
LCDR	24.0	23.6
CDR	3.1	1.1

TABLE 5. Respondents' MBTI Type

MBTI Type	% Women	% Men
% RESPONDING	54%	37%
INTJ	11.3	7.9
INFJ	9.7	5.3
INTP	9.7	7.9
INFP	8.1	5.3
ENTJ	9.7	13.2
ENFJ	6.5	5.3
ENTP	4.8	7.9
ENFP	9.7	5.3
ISTJ	6.5	10.5
ISFJ	4.8	5.3
ISTP		2.6
ISFP	3.2	
ESTJ	8.1	13.2
ESFJ	6.5	2.6
ESTP	1.6	7.9
ESFP		

Table 6 & 7, respectively, display the primary and secondary career path of the respondents. It is interesting to ponder the significance of the differences revealed for gender, more men have chosen aviation and afloat commands as a primary career path, while more women have chosen marine safety and ashore operations. In terms of secondary career path, more women have chosen administration while more men have chosen ashore operations.

Table 6. Primary career path of respondents

Primary Career Path	Women % Responding	Men % Responding
Administration	3.4	1.1
Aviation	9.1	17.2
Marine Safety	21.6	16.1
Afloat Command	12.5	21.8
Engineering Afloat	15.9	11.5
Afloat	11.4	10.3
Engineering Ashore	2.3	1.1
Ashore Operations	17.0	8.0
Other	6.8	12.6

Table 7. Primary career path of respondents

Secondary Career Path	Women	Men
	% Responding	% Responding
Administration	26.0	6.8
Aviation	1.4	5.5
Marine Safety	2.7	1.4
Afloat Command	2.7	9.6
Engineering Afloat	5.5	6.8
Afloat	15.1	19.2
Engineering Ashore	9.6	5.5
Ashore Operations	13.7	23.3
Other	23.3	21.9

Data Analysis Summary⁵

The first section of the survey asked respondents to reflect back, to the best of their ability, on their cadet experiences at CGA. Gender differences were noted for five of the questions and current-rank difference was noted for one question. For two of the three questions dealing with acceptance, "I felt aligned with the military career choice by the end of my second class year" and "As a cadet, I felt accepted by male classmates" a difference beyond chance was noted between the women and men's responses (t-test for independent samples: t [df = 212] = 4.51, $p < .001$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.43, \bar{X} men's responses = 1.95]; t [df = 94] = 8.84, $p < .001$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.46; \bar{X} men's responses = 1.63] respectively). Women cadets reported feeling less aligned with their military career choice than did men and less accepted by male classmates than did men. Interestingly, there was no difference beyond chance noted for gender by current-rank for these two questions, indicating that over the last 20 years, these two opinions about the cadet experience have not changed.

While there was no difference beyond chance noted for gender for the question, "As a cadet I felt accepted by women classmates," a difference beyond chance was found for current rank revealing that current LTjgs and LTs, both men and women, remember feeling more accepted by women classmates than did Commanders (ANOVA: $F(4,175) = 4.30$, $p < .002$ ENS $\bar{X} = 2.26$, LTJG $\bar{X} = 1.82$, LT $\bar{X} = 1.90$, LCDR $\bar{X} = 2.10$, CDR $\bar{X} = 3.33$).

Question -- "I felt aligned with the military career choice by the end of my second class year."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	13.2	41.2	35.1	10.5
Men	25.5	55.9	16.7	2.0

Question -- "As A cadet I felt accepted by male classmates."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	7.1	54.0	23.9	15.0
Men	40.2	56.9	2.9	

Question -- "As a cadet, I felt accepted by women classmates."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	27.4	46.0	20.4	5.3
Men	21.0	70.0	6.0	3.0

Two questions assessed the degree to which graduates believed that men and women are competitive and two asked whether graduates believe that as cadets men were encouraged to network with other men and women were encouraged to network with other women. No mean differences beyond chance were noted for either question "Women cadets are more

⁵ The data were analyzed using SPSS-X for Macintosh. For Likert-type scale questions, data were first analyzed for gender differences and then current rank; when no gender differences were noted the data were combined and analyzed for current rank. For experiential questions, percentages are reported separately for each gender.

competitive with each other than are with men cadets" or "Men cadets are more competitive with each other than they are with women cadets"; the distribution of percentages are displayed below.

Question -- "Women cadets are more competitive with each other than they are with men cadets"

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	9.8	34.8	31.3	23.2
Men	9.1	15.2	60.6	8.1

Question -- "Men cadets are more competitive with each other than they are with women cadets"

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	13.3	37.2	40.7	8.0
Men	19.2	36.4	40.4	3.1

Two questions assessed whether cadets are encouraged to network with each other "Women cadets are encouraged to network with each other" and "Male cadets are encouraged to network with each other." Analysis revealed a mean difference beyond chance for gender (t-test for independent samples: t [df, 166] = 2.86, $p < .005$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.78, \bar{X} men's responses = 2.35]; t [df, 206] = -2.62, $p < .009$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.23, \bar{X} men's responses = 2.52] respectively). Additionally, there is an interesting distribution of response percentages for these two questions. Apparently, men believe that women were encouraged to network with other women and women believe that men were encouraged to network with other men (cf. below).

Question -- "Women cadets are encouraged to network with each other"

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	4.5	33.0	43.8	17.9
Men	23.0	50.0	11.0	1.0

Question -- "Male cadets are encouraged to network with each other."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	23.9	33.0	39.4	3.7
Men	6.0	44.0	43.0	6.0

Six questions in the first section assessed the degree to which graduates believe that they were afforded necessary leadership experiences while at CGA and that they met men and women officers who were good examples of leaders. Only one question of the six employed a Likert-type format, "As a cadet I was given the leadership experiences I required to prepare me for my first assignment," and analysis revealed a difference beyond chance for gender (t-test for independent samples: t (df = 211) = 2.68, $p < .008$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.39, \bar{X} men's responses = 2.11]).

Question -- "As a cadet I was given the leadership experiences I required to prepare me for my first assignment"

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	8.8	51.8	30.7	8.8
Men	17.8	56.4	21.8	4.0

To examine which CGA experiences cadets find motivating, they were asked to indicate "The components of your experiences at CGA, which strengthened your desire to remain and graduate?" The results are displayed on Table 8; academics, summer cruise experiences, and sport-team membership were ranked the highest.

Table 8. CGA Programs graduates remembered as motivating.

CGA Programs	Percent Responding	
	Women	Men
Academics	43.5	46.1
Summer Cruise	41.7	47.1
Sports team membership	30.4	40.2
Extracurricular activities	24.3	22.5
Athletic program	21.7	26.5
Leadership Program	16.5	24.5
Cadre Experiences	14.8	28.4
Summer Training	4.09	42.2

Four questions assessed whether graduates remembered meeting women and men officers who were good officers and leadership role models. It appears to be easier for both men and women graduates to remember men officers who are both good leaders and good role models than it is for them to remember women officers who are good leaders and/or role models.

Question --- "While at the Academy, did you meet women officers who were good leaders?"

Response Alternatives	Yes	No	Don't Remember
Percentage Responding			
Women	62.8	31.0	6.2
Men	67.3	24.8	7.9

Question --- "While at the Academy, did you meet women officers who were good role models?"

Response Alternatives	Yes	No	Don't Remember
Percentage Responding			
Women	57.7	33.3	9.0
Men	67.0	22.0	11.0

Question --- "While at the Academy, did you meet men officers who were good leaders?"

Response Alternatives	Yes	No	Don't Remember
Percentage Responding			
Women	90.4	6.1	3.5
Men	96.0	4.0	

Question --- "While at the Academy, did you meet men officers who were good role models?"

Response Alternatives	Yes	No	Don't Remember
Percentage Responding			
Women	94.7	2.7	2.7
Men	96.0	4.0	

First Assignment

The second section of the survey asked graduates about their first assignments. Table 9 displays the type of ship to which the graduates were assigned.

Table 9. First ship assignments

Type of Ship	Women	Men
Percent Responding		
270	24.8	26.0
378	23.0	26.0
210	24.8	25.0
180 or WLB	24.8	21.0
Ice Breaker	2.7	2.0

After an open ended question asking graduates to reflect on the leadership challenges that they had to face as a junior officer, there was a series of attitudinal and experiential questions. Two questions assessed the degree to which they felt confident both at the beginning of their first assignment and at its end. For both of these questions "Upon graduation, I felt prepared to handle the responsibilities of division officer during my first assignment" and "I felt confident of my leadership ability by the end of my first tour," a difference beyond chance was noted for gender (t -test for independent samples: t ($df = 212$) = 3.04, $p < .003$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.46, \bar{X} men's responses = 2.15]; t ($df = 199$) = 4.82, $p < .001$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 1.99, \bar{X} men's responses = 2.50], respectively). The response percentages clearly suggest that the men felt more confident in both situations.

Question -- "Upon graduation, I felt prepared to handle the responsibility of division officer during my first assignment."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	8.8	43.9	40.4	7.0
Men	15.7	58.8	20.6	4.9

Question -- "I felt confident of my leadership ability by the end of my first tour."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	28.4	49.5	16.5	5.5
Men	56.3	38.5	4.2	1.0

Respondents were asked whether they believe that their OERs during this assignment accurately reflected their performance and whether they felt respected by their subordinates. For both of these questions, "My OER accurately reflected my performance as an officer," and "I felt respected by my subordinates," a difference beyond chance was noted for gender (t -test for independent samples: t ($df = 212$) = 3.42, $p < .001$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 2.35, \bar{X} men's responses = 2.01]; t ($df = 202$) = 3.32, $p < .001$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 1.86, \bar{X} men's responses = 1.59], respectively.)

Question --- "My OER accurately reflected my performance as an officer."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	9.7	53.1	28.2	8.0
Men	19.6	64.7	10.8	4.9

Question -- "I felt respected by my subordinates."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	28.8	58.6	9.9	2.7
Men	42.2	56.9	1.0	

In addition to another open-ended question which asked respondents to describe their most vivid example of a leadership challenge during their first assignment, they were asked from whom they received most of their leadership guidance during this first tour. Table 10 displays their responses; while there is no clear guidance person for women, XO's appear to offer guidance to men.

Table 10. From whom graduates received leadership guidance on first assignment.

Leadership Guidance	Women	Men
	Percentage Responding	
CO	4.8	7.1
XO	12.9	24.3
OPS	17.7	19.6
EO	9.7	12.9
LTJg	11.3	4.3
Peers	3.2	4.3
CWO	9.7	1.4
CPO	14.5	12.9
Own Initiative	11.3	4.3
Other POs		

Other	4.8	
-------	-----	--

Mentoring

The third section of the survey asked graduates questions about mentoring. Tables 11 through 16 display their responses to a question which asked them to rank order a series of characteristics which have been mentioned in the mentoring literature. As can be observed, there was considerable agreement between both women and men. The characteristics which these individuals suggested were most important in a mentor include competence, communication skills, being experienced and knowledgeable, having leadership ability, and being supportive.

Table 11 Participant's rank order of various mentor characteristics

Percentage of men and women responding for each adjective					
Advocate	Women	Men	Communication	Women	Men
Rank order			Rank order		
1	6.0	2.2	1	45.9	60.6
2	1.0	2.2	2	51.4	39.4
3	4.0		3	2.7	
4	4.0	1.1	4		
5	3.0	4.5	5		
6	12.0	6.7	6		
7	9.0	7.9	7		
8	10.0	20.2	8		
9	12.0	19.1	9		
10	14.0	10.1	10		
11	18.0	24.7	11		
12	7.0	1.1	12		

Table 12 Participant's rank order of various mentor characteristics

Percentage of men and women responding for each adjective					
Competent	Women	Men	Empathetic	Women	Men
Rank			Rank		
1	25.0	22.6	1	5.9	3.3
2	22.2	18.3	2	2.0	2.2
3	16.7	15.1	3	2.0	1.1
4	8.3	11.8	4	5.9	5.5
5	6.5	14.0	5	5.9	1.1
6	10.2	7.5	6	5.9	17.7
7	2.8	4.3	7	5.0	12.1
8	2.8	3.2	8	8.9	8.8
9	2.8		9	14.9	12.1
10	1.9	3.2	10	19.8	23.1
11	.9		11	20.8	22.0
12			12	3.0	1.1

Table 13 Participant's rank order of various mentor characteristics

Percentage of men and women responding for each adjective					
Experienced	Women	Men	Fair	Women	Men
Rank			Rank		
1	20.8	18.9	1	4.0	5.5
2	14.2	18.9	2	2.0	3.3
3	15.1	9.5	3	4.0	7.7
4	22.6	16.8	4	7.0	5.5
5	9.4	11.6	5	17.0	9.9
6	7.5	3.2	6	11.0	15.4
7	2.8	5.3	7	14.0	15.4
8	2.8	4.2	8	15.0	12.1
9	.9	3.2	9	16.0	5.5
10	.9	5.3	10	5.0	13.2
11	2.8	3.2	11	5.0	6.6

12			12		
----	--	--	----	--	--

Table 14 Participant's rank order of various mentor characteristics

Percentage of men and women responding for each adjective					
Helpful	Women	Men	Knowledgeable	Women	Men
Rank			Rank		
1	7.6	7.7	1	14.8	15.1
2	2.9	3.3	2	20.4	18.3
3	3.8	12.1	3	21.3	23.7
4	5.7	9.9	4	13.9	17.2
5	12.4	8.8	5	7.4	7.5
6	7.6	13.2	6	9.3	5.4
7	17.1	5.5	7	7.4	5.4
8	19.0	11.0	8	2.8	3.2
9	8.6	11.0	9	.9	2.2
10	6.7	8.8	10	.9	1.1
11	6.7	8.8	11	.9	1.1
12	1.9		12		

Table 15 Participant's rank order of various mentor characteristics

Percentage of men and women responding for each adjective					
Leadership	Women	Men	Nurturant	Women	Men
Rank			Rank		
1	17.3	26.4	1	5.1	3.4
2	12.5	9.2	2	4.0	9.1
3	7.7	10.3	3	4.0	3.4
4	11.5	10.3	4	1.0	4.5
5	7.7	13.8	5	3.0	5.7
6	11.5	8.0	6	5.1	11.4
7	6.7	6.9	7	7.1	11.4
8	8.7	5.7	8	8.1	9.1
9	8.7	3.4	9	6.1	18.2
10	4.8	3.4	10	27.3	19.3
11	2.9	2.3	11	25.3	3.4
12			12	4.0	1.1

Table 16 Participant's rank order of various mentor characteristics

Percentage of men and women responding for each adjective					
Objective	Women	Men	Supportive	Women	Men
Rank					
1	4.0	3.3	1	17.2	13.3
2	5.9	3.3	2	11.4	7.8
3	7.9	5.6	3	11.4	13.3
4	6.9	5.6	4	13.3	14.4
5	12.9	8.9	5	10.5	14.4
6	14.9	12.2	6	5.7	12.2
7	12.9	16.7	7	8.6	6.7
8	11.9	11.1	8	7.6	4.4
9	7.9	20.3	9	7.6	10.0
10	9.9	4.4	10	4.8	3.3
11	4.0	7.8	11	1.9	
12	1.0	1.1	12		

When asked whether the Coast Guard should have a formal mentor program, 61% of the women and 47% of the men said yes but only 25% of the women and 9% of the men in this group have participated in the mentor program the Coast Guard does have. On the other hand, the data displayed on Table 17 suggests that both men and women officers have found mentors; albeit women have had fewer.

Table 17. Number of formal and informal mentors by gender.

Number of formal and informal mentors				
Number of	Percentage having Formal Mentors		Percentage having Informal Mentors	
Mentors	Women	Men	Women	Men
0-1	96.2	88.2	19.1	11.3
2-5	3.8	10.8	62.9	60.8
6-10		1.1	12.7	18.6
> 10			5.5	9.3

There were several questions which asked about the gender of mentors, both for officers and cadets. For the question, "The gender of a mentor is important," a difference beyond chance was noted for gender (t -test for independent samples: t (df = 199) = 2.32, $p < .021$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 3.13, \bar{X} men's responses]). The percentage responding to each response alternative suggest that men are more sensitive to the gender of a mentor than are women.

Question -- "The gender of a mentor is important."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	5.4	12.6	54.0	36.9
Men	12.0	16.0	47.0	25.0

This may reflect a basic necessity for women. With fewer women officers and more men in senior positions, women may not have as great a choice in who becomes their mentor as do men. To explore this area, responders were asked about their cross-gender mentoring experiences, 80% of the women but only 49% of men responders have had the opportunity to be in a cross-gender mentoring relationship. In these experiences, 30% of the men and 2% of the women were the mentors, 51% of women and 32% of men were the mentee, and 40% of women and 38% of men were both the mentor and mentee in a cross-gender mentoring relationship. When asked whether they were comfortable with this relationship, 97% of the women and 91% of the men said yes.

Interestingly, however, when the question was related to cadets, the difference noted for gender disappears (cf. below).

Question --- "Cadets should mentor each other."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	24.3	53.3	12.1	10.3
Men	19.6	57.7	16.5	6.2

Question -- "Cadet mentoring programs should be...?"

Response Alternatives	Formal	Informal	Both	Neither
	Percentage Responding			
Women	4.6	41.4	51.7	2.3
Men	6.3	42.5	48.8	2.5

Question --- "The gender of a cadet mentor is important."

Response Alternatives	Yes	No
	Percentage Responding	
Women	33.7	66.3
Men	31.4	67.4

Men and women responders were also similar in their answers concerning whether officers should mentor cadets (cf. below).

Question -- "Officers should mentor cadets."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	41.7	53.7	.9	3.7
Men	44.3	42.3	9.3	4.4

Question -- "Officer mentor programs for cadets should be...?"

Response Alternatives	Formal	Informal	Both	Neither
	Percentage Responding			
Women	2.8	33.0	64.2	
Men	4.5	29.5	63.6	2.3

Men and women were also similar in their response to whether they had had mentors as cadets.

Question --- "During my stay at CGA, I had a mentoring experience with..."

Response Alternatives	A senior Cadet	An Officer	A Civilian Faculty	A Coach
	Percentage Responding			
Women	34.8	52.8	19.1	30.4
Men	44.1	56.9	18.6	30.4

The fourth section of the survey contained a series of general questions. One of the questions asked responders to estimate the numbers of Coast Guard officers who actively support the three Coast Guard Core Values, "Respect for others," "Honor," and "Devotion to duty," and the number who actively hold others accountable for their actions (cf. below).

Question -- Officers' perceptions of other officers commitment to Coast Guard Core Values.

Response Alternatives	< 25%	26-50%	51-75%	> 75%
Value	Percentage Responding			
Respect for others				
Women	9.6	20.2	43.0	27.2
Men	2.0	10.2	33.7	54.1
Honor				
Women	7.0	21.9	39.5	31.6
Men	3.1	13.3	33.7	50.0
Devotion to Duty				
Women	3.5	11.4	39.5	54.6
Men	1.0	14.3	44.6	39.8
Hold others Accountable				
Women	31.0	24.8	22.1	22.1
Men	8.2	15.5	48.5	27.8

A difference for rank was noted for the question, "On average, Coast Guard Officers have jobs that allow them to grow as leaders" (ANOVA: $F(4,162) = 3.35, p < .01$ [$\bar{X}_{ENS} = 1.82, \bar{X}_{LTjg} = 1.85, \bar{X}_{LT} = 1.96, \bar{X}_{LCDR} = 1.70, \bar{X}_{CDR} = 3.0$]).

Question -- "On average, Coast Guard officers have jobs that allow them to grow as leaders."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	22.3	62.5	13.4	1.8
Men	29.0	56.0	15.0	

A gender difference was noted for the question, "My career to date has been successful (t-test for independent samples: $t(df = 208) = 2.95, p < .004$ [\bar{X} women's responses = 1.82, \bar{X} men's responses = 1.54]).

Question -- "My career to date has been successful."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	35.7	50.0	10.7	3.6
Men	52.0	43.0	4.0	1.0

A difference beyond chance was noted for the next two questions. Analysis revealed a difference by current-rank for "As a cadet -- contact with women officers strengthened my desire to be an officer" while a gender difference was noted for "As an officer -- contact with men officers strengthened my desire to be an officer" (ANOVA: $F(4,166) = 5.20, p < .001$ [$\bar{X}_{ENS} = 2.75, \bar{X}_{LTjg} = 2.70, \bar{X}_{LT} = 2.76, \bar{X}_{LCDR} = 3.47, \bar{X}_{CDR} = 4.25$]; t-test for independent samples: $t(df = 198) = 2.07, p < .04$ [$\bar{X}_{women's responses} = 2.07, \bar{X}_{men's responses} = 2.04$] respectively).

Question -- "Contact with women officers strengthened my desire to be an officer."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
As a cadet	Percentage Responding			
Women	12.4	31.0	26.5	17.7
Men	5.2	27.1	38.5	14.6
As an officer	Percentage Responding			
Women	15.0	32.7	43.0	6.5
Men	9.6	37.2	42.5	9.6

Question -- "Contact with men officers strengthened my desire to be an officer."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
As a cadet	Percentage Responding			
Women	11.8	63.6	17.3	7.3
Men	17.5	64.9	15.5	3.1
As an officer	Percentage Responding			
Women	16.8	45.8	30.8	6.5
Men	22.3	54.3	20.2	3.2

The last three quantitative questions focused on gender influences. For the first two questions, "It is important to understand the differences and similarities between the genders" and "It is important to understand how gender stereotypes influence our perceptions of individuals' behavior" no difference beyond chance was noted for gender.

Question -- "It is important to understand the differences and similarities between the genders."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	40.7	54.9	4.4	
Men	48.9	39.0	9.0	4.0

Question -- "It is important to understand how gender stereotypes influence our perceptions of individuals' behavior."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	48.7	47.8	3.5	
Men	44.6	49.5	3.0	3.0

However, for the questions, "CGA provided me with opportunities to become informed about gender issues that affect the work-place" and "In the Coast Guard now, women are as likely to reach all of the rank as are men" a difference beyond chance was noted for gender (t-test for independent samples: $t(df = 208) = 3.85, p < .008$ [$\bar{X}_{women's responses} = 2.80, \bar{X}_{men's responses} = 2.34$; $t(df = 206) = 6.44, p < .001$ [$\bar{X}_{women's responses} = 2.41, \bar{X}_{men's responses} = 1.69$] respectively).

Question -- "CGA provided me with opportunities to become informed about gender issues that affect the workplace."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	6.3	34.8	31.3	27.7
Men	12.2	49.0	30.6	8.2

Question -- "In the coast Guard now, women are as likely to reach all of the ranks as are men."

Response Alternatives	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Percentage Responding			
Women	14.7	40.4	33.9	11.0
Men	45.0	43.0	11.0	1.0

Lastly, responders were asked whether they have continued to learn about gender issues. For those who have, Table 19 displays the data on the means that they have used.

Table 18. Means to obtain information gender related issues.

Means	Women	Men
	Percentage Responding	
Reading		
Books	53.0	33.3
Magazines	50.0	49.0
Newspapers	39.1	43.1
Discussions with		
Peers	82.6	80.4
Seniors	62.6	61.8
Subordinates	60.0	59.8
Attending		
Seminars	33.0	21.6
Workshops	25.2	11.8